DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 832 SP 004 078

TITLE	APERIODIC Report: Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Evaluation. TTT Evaluation Progress Report No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Consortium of Professional Associations.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	47p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.45
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation Methods, *Program Evaluation, *Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program, TTT Program

ABSTRACT

This is the first of a series of reports to be issued at irregular intervals to communicate the plans, progress, and findings of the evaluation of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program. The first 12 pages of the report outline in three general categories the activities carried out to date: 1) visits to cluster meetings and individual projects and conversations with key people connected with TTT; 2) staff meetings to bring together the results of information collected during visits; 3) the preliminarydevelopment of interview schedules, questionnaires, and observational techniques. The remainder of the report contains the data-gathering devices that have been developed: the Cluster Meeting Observation Form, the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire, the Cluster Meeting Registration Form, the Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards, the Site Visitor Questionnaire, and the Site Visitor Briefing Session Observation Instrument. (RT)

ED041832

APERIODIC REPORT

Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Evaluation

NO. 1

TTT EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT

December 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted to

CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

by

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
(CIRCE)
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

SP004078

EVALUATION STAFF

J. Thomas Hastings, Director
Arden Grotelueschen, Associate Director
Douglas D. Sjogren, Associate Director

Assistants

David N. Addison
Clencie L. Cotton
Peggy E. Lents
Margaret H. Pjojian
Gary A. Storm

ED041832

APERIODIC REPORT: TRAINERS OF TEACHER TRAINERS (TTT) EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NO. 1

TTT EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT

December 1969

A brief progress report about the evaluation of the TTT national program and a plan of future evaluation activities.

Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
(CIRCE)
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-3771

PREFACE TO THE SERIES

This report is the first of series designed to communicate the plans, the progress, the instrumentation, and the findings of the evaluation of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program conducted by the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE).

There are several audiences for these reports, and for each audience a given report may serve different purposes. Of necessity a primary audience is the funding agency for this evaluation endeavor, the Consortium for Professional Associations (CONPASS). Another important audience is the U. S. Office of Education, Division of College Programs, TTT Branch.

These primary recipients of the reports may share the reports with selected secondary audiences (e.g., TTT Project Directors, Association of American Geographers). The specific use made of each report by the primary or secondary audience is dependent upon the extent to which a report provides information relevant to the needs of the specific group. For example, the following Progress Report -- of which a preliminary report was presented to the CONPASS Board in October, 1969 -- may be used by CONPASS simply to monitor their project. They also may use it as a basis for suggesting special aspects they would like studied. The Division of College Programs, USOE, on the other hand, may find it useful to demonstrate to the hierarchy the types of information being generated for assessing the total program. A future report on clustering might be used by CONPASS as a partial basis for discussion of interdisciplinary efforts, since clusters are for the most part mixed in subject

focus. The same report may be used by the Division of College Programs for assessment of goal accomplishment, while the TTT Program Director in the Division of College Programs might want to use it as a means for altering certain cluster activities.

There is little point in issuing reports on a periodic basis -- biweekly, monthly, quarterly -- unless useable information is received and needs for this information occur at regular intervals. Obviously either case rarely occurs. Reports in this series will appear as soon as relevant information is at hand. Hopefully the obtained information will be timely to the audience(s) for whom it was prepared. This means that the reports will be aperiodic. On some occasions one will follow another within a very short interval; in other cases, a month or two may elapse. We certainly cannot now foresee the situation in which more than three to four months would pass without reportable information.

For the present funding period, it is our expectation that as many as nine or as few as five reports will be made. Some reports now visioned as two separate reports might be printed as one report.

J. T. H.
A. D. G.
D. D. S.

PROGRESS REPORT

CIRCE started its evaluation work on the TTT program in February 1969. The first thing we had to do was to see how the expectations we drew from the literature and history of TTT corresponded to the claims of purpose and intent voiced in the field -- i.e., by those who have projects. The second thing, not unrelated, was to ascertain what some of the significant variables might be -- that is, what variables are of practical value to those who have projects in the program. At that point in time it seemed useful -- and now we are convinced that it was useful -- to make all of the observations we could (without being evaluative) of the various component parts of TTT: projects which were operational in the summer of 1969, cluster meetings, and the LTI. Another purpose for visiting various components was that of getting people in the projects to view us as a group which might be helpful, as opposed to perceiving us as spies or as individuals who would have a major effect on the funding of individual projects. We have reason to believe, largely because of the kinds of questions we are asking and the apparent openness of the responses we have received from those involved in local projects, that this second purpose has been accomplished in the majority of cases.

One of the problems we have faced grows from the large number of requests we have received from TTT projects to participate in or consult on evaluation activities at the local level. Putting aside the matter of available time, we have agreed within the evaluation team that it would not be appropriate for any of us (nor for anyone in CIRCE) to work on

local-project evaluation plans. There is too much possibility of misunderstanding our effects on funding. Consequently, we have had to refer requests for help from local projects in need of evaluation to persons or agencies with capabilities of extending help.

Activities

There have been three distinct types of activity: (1) visits to meetings and projects and conversations with key people connected with TTT; (2) staff meetings to bring together the results of information collected in visitations along with our study of documents in order to plan effectively the over-all instrumentation and points of focus; and (3) the preliminary development of interview schedules and questionnaires as well as observational techniques. These activities are described briefly in that order in the following pages of this section.

Visits

LTI. In March and again in August individuals from the evaluation team had interviews with Dr. Harry Rivlin, Chairman of TTT LTI. Dr. Terry Denny interviewed on the first occasion, and Mr. David Addison did the second interview. From these we obtained information regarding the functions and strategies of LTI, the basic purposes and modes of functioning of the TTT program, and the input to the total program of community groups.

On September 27, Dr. Arden Grotelueschen and Dr. J. Thomas Hastings attended an LTI meeting in Washington in which plans were further formulated for the November site visits to projects. On October 22 and 23 a team of participant observers (Dr. Arden Grotelueschen, Dr. Douglas

Sjogren, Mr. Clencie Cotton, Miss Margaret Pjojian, Mr. Gary Storm) attended the LIT site visitors briefing in Chicago. Systematic observations were made of most aspects of this meeting by the observers. Such meetings are very important to us for the insights into the objects of concern in the program.

USOE-BEPD. Various members of the staff have visited with the personnel in BEPD who are directing and monitoring the program. Dr. Hastings spent time on several occasions during the summer with Dr. Daniel Bernd. In September Dr. Arden Grotelueschen and Dr. Douglas Sjogren visited with the following people: Dr. Dustin Wilson, who is directing the section dealing with TTT; his Deputy Director, Dr. Mary Jane Smalley; and two people in that office who helped them locate documents, Lorna Polk and Shirley Radcliffe. On that visit the two read all available prospectuses from "places" which were seeking funding for the next fiscal period.

CIRCE-O'Hare Meeting. On July 28 a meeting was held at O'Hare Airport by the CIRCE evaluation group with people from USOE and from CONPASS. The following people were present: from USOE -- Daniel Bernd, Donald Bigelow, Frank McLain, Nathan Pitts, Allen Schmieder; from CONPASS -- Saul Cohen, Joseph Palaia; from the Tri-University Project -- Gabriel Della-Piana; from CIRCE -- David Addison, Terry Denny, Dennis Gooler, Arden Grotelueschen, J. Thomas Hastings, Martin Maehr, Joyce Riley, Douglas Sjogren, Lois Williamson. The purpose of that meeting was to elicit more information on the expectations for TTT and to discuss the evaluation of TTT.

Grove Park Institute. Mrs. Joyce Riley was an observer for the evaluation team at the June 10 - 15 meeting held by CONPASS at Asheville,

North Carolina. Although we knew that we would get to study the report of the meeting, it was useful to have a person from the staff present for the collection of impressions and specific descriptions. Although the meeting was not on the TTT program, many of the ideas expressed there relate to that operation.

Bertram Masia. Since Dr. Masia conducted the beginning phase of the TTT evaluation, we have studied his first partial report given at the ETS Invitational Conference on Testing Problems in New York City last October. Also, Mrs. Joyce Riley had an interview with Dr. Masia in Cleveland on May 12, 1969.

Cluster Meetings. We have been diligent in attending cluster meetings. Not only are these good situations in which to find out more about individual projects and the program as a whole, but the "cluster" idea is a very real force in the national program. The following cluster meetings have been visited by the person(s) designated:

West Coast, San Diego, California	June 27-28	Terry Denny
Southern and Appalachian, Atlanta, Georgia	July 24-25	Thomas Hastings Terry Denny
Southwestern, Denver, Colorado	July 25-27	Douglas Sjogren Thomas Hastings
Midwest, Chicago, Illinois	July 28-29	Terry Denny
Northeastern, New York City	October 2-4	Arden Grotelueschen David Addison
Midwest, Minneapolis, Minnesota	November 5-7	Douglas Sjogren Clencie Cotton
West Coast, Seattle, Washington	November 7-9	Gary Storm

Projects. Our intent in visiting individual projects is not for the purpose of evaluating the local project. Our purpose is to take that sort of first-hand look which helps give meaning to verbal descriptions of projects. The following visits to specific sites have been made:

University of Nebraska, Dr. Paul Olson	July	Martin Maehr
University of Illinois, mathematics, English, education	July	Terry Denny
University of Miami, Dr. Gerald Faust	July 14-15	Dennis Gooler Joyce Riley
University of West Virginia, Morgantown	August 10-11	David Addison Joyce Riley

Staff Meetings

Staff meetings were held at least once every two weeks in the early stages of the evaluation work. Since September they have been held weekly. By the end of September we had conceptualized an over-all evaluation plan, i.e., areas of focus, sources of data, times for collection, and types of analyses. More recently the weekly staff meetings have provided a means for coordinating the work efforts of the various members of the evaluation team.

Instrument Development

A number of instruments have been developed, and are currently being used as data gathering devices. Other instruments are in different preliminary stages.

Those instruments that have been developed are the Cluster Meeting Observation Form (Appendix A), the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire (Appendix B), the Cluster Meeting Registration Form (Appendix C), the Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards (Appendix D), the Site

Visitor Questionnaire (Appendix E), and the Site Visitor Briefing Session Observation Instrument (somewhat similar to the Cluster Meeting Observation Form but uneconomical to exhibit separately).

It is anticipated that a phone interview schedule for cluster directors about clustering activities and for project directors about project level information will be developed in the near future. Also, a comprehensive project level interview schedule will quite possibly be developed in the next few months.

EVALUATION PLAN

The following material contains a summarization of the various data gathering activities that will have occurred by June 30, 1970. Each of the components is described in some detail and include a rationale for gathering the data and for the variables included in the instruments along with a tentative time schedule for each component.

Clustering

During this year the six clusters of the TTT program were formed. There were apparently two primary purposes for the clusters. One purpose was to have the clusters serve as a medium for project monitoring by U.S.O.E. The other purpose was that the clusters would facilitate communication and dissemination among the TTT projects. We regard the clustering activity as an important transaction or process of the TTT program and consequently an important component on which we should gather data. The main purpose of our data gathering is to attempt to determine whether the intended purposes for the clusters are being attained. At the same time, however, we are also gathering data on who is participating

in the cluster activity, what types of clustering are occurring, what are the perceptions and attitudes of the various participants toward the cluster, and what is occurring in the cluster meetings. These variables may very possibly relate to the success of the cluster component.

Our data gathering with respect to clustering has consisted of the following:

1. We have had an observer or observers at all but two cluster meetings to observe and report on what occurred in the cluster meetings. Data have been gathered by use of the Cluster Meeting Observation Form (Appendix A). We expect to continue with this kind of data gathering activity.

2. We are now receiving completed responses obtained from the TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire (Appendix B) that was sent to a randomly selected sample of cluster meeting participants and to all project directors who attended the most recent cluster meeting held by a cluster prior to December 1. Sixty-two per cent (109 out of 175) of the questionnaires have returned from a first mailing and a follow-up letter has been mailed to persons who have not returned their questionnaires.

3. A Cluster Meeting Registration Form (Appendix C) was developed for use in forthcoming cluster meetings. That is, the January meetings of the Southwestern (Houston) and the Social Science (New Orleans) are expected to be the first meetings in which this instrument will be used. The purpose of the instrument is to provide descriptive data of cluster meeting participants.

4. We are planning a telephone interview of cluster directors to occur during the last part of January in which we will ask many of the same questions as asked of the participants. In addition, questions on the administration of the cluster component, cluster training functions, relations with other components such as LTI, U.S.O.E., etc. will be ascertained.

5. A CIRCE representative (Dr. Hastings) attended the meeting of TTT cluster directors and U.S.O.E. personnel in New Orleans in December. A summary of this meeting has been prepared for intra-office use.

We expect to prepare a preliminary report on clustering by the first part of February. This report will contain a presentation of the questionnaire data. An Aperiodic Report on clustering is planned for the end of February. This report will include an analysis and discussion of all available data on the clustering component.

Site Visit

Another important process or transaction of the TTT program was the LTI site visit component which occurred in November and December. About 150 persons went in teams of four or five to visit TTT projects. Each team visited one project and each member of the team reported on the visit. The site visitors had little or no contact with TTT prior to the site visit. The site visitors met in Chicago on the 22nd and 23rd of October for an orientation session and the visits occurred after this session. The purposes of the site visit appeared to be to disseminate the concept of TTT to a wide and influential audience, to identify a talent pool for TTT projects, and to provide advice and counsel to project

directors. The extent to which these purposes were achieved appears to be an important variable about which data might be gathered.

It was felt that the site visit was a significant activity and should receive attention from the program evaluators. The following list indicates the data gathering activities that have occurred or are in progress for the site visit component.

1. Five evaluation staff members participated in the LTI site visitor briefing as observers. Observations were recorded independently by each observer using a specially prepared Site Visitory Briefing Session Observation Instrument.

2. Information concerning knowledge, understandings, and attitudes of the participants at the site visitor briefing sessions was obtained about a number of topics concerning TTT in general, site visiting and the role of the participants in it, and the effectiveness of the site visitor briefing sessions themselves. Each participant received one of ten different postal cards from the evaluation staff four days after the meeting. (See Appendix D for copies of these cards.) Each postal card contained from one to five items, some requiring objective, and others open-ended,responses. Each of the ten "sub-questionnaires" was sent to an almost equal number of representatives from each of the four parity groups (education, liberal arts, schools, and community). The total number of postal cards mailed was 164. Of these 117 (71%) were returned. No follow-up was made of non-respondents.

3. A Site Visitor Questionnaire (Appendix E) is being sent to the site visitors during the week of January 19 in which questions are asked of relevance to the purposes of the site visit. Thus the visitors are

asked to respond with their perceptions and attitude toward various aspects of the project they visited and to the TTT national program.

4. It is anticipated that project directors will be asked to respond with their impressions of the site visit and the report made by the visitors when data is gathered by the evaluation staff at the project level.

5. The Crockett report based on the site visitors reports as well as the individual site visitor reports will be provided us in the near future.

Except for the data from the project directors, it is our intention to present an analysis and discussion of the site visit data in an Aperiodic Report to be issued around the end of February. We hope also to have an earlier preliminary report of the data on impressions of TTT by the site visitors, possibly by February 13.

Project Information

The project level is where the degree of success of the TTT program is determined, and certainly our greatest evaluative efforts should be at this level. In October we were planning for a data gathering effort at the project level in December and January. The site visit occurred, however, and we felt that it would not be desirable to attempt to gather data when the site visits were occurring. Consequently, we postponed data gathering at the project level and concentrated on getting data on the site visit and cluster activities.

Our data gathering activity plans at the project level are described as follows:

1. A few projects were visited last summer and we have reports from

persons visiting these projects. These visits were more for the purpose of identifying variables and familiarizing the staff to project activities than data gathering per se. Consequently the reports are not intended to be used in any other way.

2. At the present time we are classifying projects according to certain descriptors such as location, operational-planning, support level, focus, base of operation, etc. We are concentrating our efforts on those projects that will continue into 1970-71. We expect to complete these descriptions during the week of January 26.

3. When we decided to postpone the data gathering at the project level we intended to do this in March and April, 1970. The program officers have indicated a desire for certain preliminary data on the projects in February. An attempt will be made to conduct a phone interview of approximately 10 project directors during the first part of February. We will select 10 projects that are operational this year and will continue to be operational next year. In the interview we intend to collect information about characteristics of participants and staff, institutional arrangements for the TTT project, how the project is administered, how parity is being handled, what curricular changes have been achieved, etc. It is felt that these data will be helpful for determining whether these projects are having an impact on the teacher education program in the institution -- an important goal of the TTT program. The instrument for the phone interviews has not yet been developed. A preliminary report of the data obtained in the project level phone interviews will hopefully be made by the middle of February.

4. Extensive data gathering at the project level will occur in March and April. We will gather data at the project level on those variables described above of relevance and others that are shown to be of significance in instrument tryout. We intend to obtain data from project directors, project staff, advisory committee members, university and school administrators, and participants either by interview or questionnaire. Attempts will be made where applicable to gather data across parity groups. We expect to employ an interviewer from the geographic area of a number of projects to gather the data for us after he has been trained by us. We anticipate employing from five to eight such persons.

In addition we have two black persons on our staff who will conduct a study of community reaction to the TTT projects. Several studies have indicated that honesty of response is related to a perceived similarity or empathy between interviewer and respondent. We feel it is essential to use black interviewers and questioners when asking questions of the black community which is a dominant minority group in TTT.

All of the data at the project level will be presented in an Aperiodic Report to be issued about the end of May. As project level instruments are developed we hope to be able to discuss them with the personnel in U.S.O.E.

APPENDIX A: Cluster Meeting Observation Form

CLUSTER MEETING OBSERVATION FORM
Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation

Cluster _____

Meeting Location _____

Meeting Dates _____

This is the _____ meeting of this cluster.

Observer _____

Instructions

Be sure to obtain a copy of all hand-out material at the meeting. A list of participants and the agenda are very important.

The questions on this form should be answered after you have attended a session. It would be well to become very familiar with the questions before you attend the meeting, but we suggest that you not use the form during the meeting. We suggest, rather, that you take notes during the meeting as though you were a participant and then complete the forms in your room using your notes and your memory. One form should be completed for each session listed on the agenda. Forms are also provided for recording information about other things like conversations, bull sessions, ad hoc meetings, etc.

It is important that the observer describe accurately the events of the cluster meeting. If observer impressions or opinions are made, they should be labeled as such.

FORMAL SESSION NO. ____

Location _____ Time _____ Date _____

1. Type of session: (*Circle one*) Lecture, Lecture-discussion, Discussion, Panel, Workshop, Reporting, Other _____ *(specify)*

2. Organization: Total group, half of the group, small group

3. Number of people in attendance: _____;

   Male _____ Female _____

   White _____ Black _____ Latin _____

   USOE _____ Community _____ School _____ Educ. _____ LAS _____ Student _____

4. Person in charge of session: _____

5. Room situation: Comments

   Seating: Adequate 5 4 3 2 1 Crowded _____

   Accoustics: Good 5 4 3 2 1 Bad _____

   Lighting: Adequate 5 4 3 2 1 Poor _____

   Comfort: Adequate 5 4 3 2 1 Poor _____

6. Complete the following for each formal presentation. (*Go to Q. 7 if session did not have a formal presentation.*)

   Presenter No. _____

   Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____ *(last) (first) (initial)*

   Title/Position _____

   Length of presentation: _____ *(time started) (time ended) (length)*

   Topic of presentation: _____

   Main points covered: _____

   _____

   _____

Rating of presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

What were the questions and the discussion about? _____

Presenter No. _____

Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
(last) (first) (initial)

Title/Position _____

Length of presentation: _____
(time started) (time ended) (length)

Topic of presentation: _____

Main points covered: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rating of presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

_____

_____

_____

What were the questions and the discussion about? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Presenter No. _____

Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
(last) (first) (initial)

Title/Position _____

Length of presentation: _____
(time started) (time ended) (length)

Topic of presentation: _____

Main points covered: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rating of presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What were the questions and the discussion about?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Complete the following if Panel Discussion (*Go to Q. 8 if not appropriate*).

Name Position

Members of the Panel: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Length of session: _____
(time started) *(time ended)* *(length)*

Topic of presentation: _____

Main points covered: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Rating of Presentation:

Organization:	Well organized	5	4	3	2	1	Poorly
Stimulation:	Very stimulating	5	4	3	2	1	Dull
Clarity:	Clear	5	4	3	2	1	Unclear
Pacing:	Well paced	5	4	3	2	1	Not well paced

Audience reaction:

Attentive:	Very attentive	5	4	3	2	1	Inattentive
Hostility:	Sympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	Hostile
Interest:	Interested	5	4	3	2	1	Disinterested
Questions:	Much questioning	5	4	3	2	1	Little questioning

General comments and impressions: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What were the questions and the discussion about? _____

_____

_____

8. Complete the following if Workshop or Discussion Session. Summarize the workshop activity or the discussion topic, i.e., what went on in the session. _____

Was there a product of the session, e.g., a consensus report, a list of issues, a plan, etc.? Yes _____ No _____

(If yes) What was it in terms of content? _____

INFORMAL ACTIVITIES

1. Describe the setting _____

2. What went on? _____

3. List the salient points covered. _____

APPENDIX B: TTT Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire

TTT CLUSTER MEETING AND CLUSTERING QUESTIONNAIRE

Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

TO SELECTED CLUSTER MEETING PARTICIPANTS:

There are many important aspects of the United States Office of Education TTT Program about which descriptions and judgments of worth might be made. As one facet in the evaluation of the TTT National Program, we at the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE) have prepared a Cluster Meeting and Clustering Questionnaire for a carefully selected sample of persons to complete. This questionnaire is designed to obtain some of your opinions about the *most recent* general cluster meeting which you attended and about TTT clustering in general. We realize the difficulty you might have in remembering specific impressions about this cluster meeting since it occurred some time ago, but we would like you to recall as best you can.

The information that you provide in this questionnaire about this specific cluster meeting and about clustering will be of value to the TTT National Program Administrators. It is important that every participant who has been sent this form complete and return this questionnaire in the self-addressed return envelope, so the reactions of the total sample will be reflected. It is our estimate that you will be able to complete this form in approximately 15 minutes.

We are asking you to indicate your name only to facilitate coordination of the returns. The questionnaire is completely confidential. Particular replies will be treated in summary form and names will *not* be associated with specific replies. Your cooperation is truly appreciated. Thank you.

Name [Mr. / Mrs. / Miss] _____ Date _____
(last) (first)

Address _____
(street) (city) (state) (zip)

Indicate where you attended your
most recent general cluster meeting _____
(city) (state)

DO NOT WRITE

1. With which one of the following parity groups do you <u>primarily</u> identify? *(Check one)*

Community.	1[ ]	11
Education.	2[ ]	
Liberal Arts	3[ ]	
Participant.	4[ ]	
School	5[ ]	

2. Within this primary parity role, what is your main working role in TTT? (Exclude cluster role.)

Project Director . .	1[ ]	Student.	4[ ]	12
LTI Member	2[ ]	Advisory Member.	5[ ]	
Project Staff. . . .	3[ ]	Consultant . . .	6[ ]	
Other _____ *(specify)*		. .	7[ ]	

3. Approximately what percent of your total working time is spent in your primary working role with TTT?

Less than 25%. . . .	1[ ]	50% - 74%. . . .	3[ ]	13
25% - 49%.	2[ ]	75% or more. . .	4[ ]	

4. Do you have a work role outside TTT? *(Check one)*

Yes . . 1[ ] No . . 2[ ] — 14

5. *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the firm or organization for whom you are employed. Give job title. Describe the nature and specific duties of your work activity.

Firm _____ ( )15 ( )16

Title _____ ( )17 ( )18

Activity and duties _____

_____

6. About what percent of your total working time is spent in this outside role? *(Check one)*

Less than 25%. . .	1[ ]	50% - 74%. . . .	3[ ]	19
25% - 49%.	2[ ]	75% or more. . .	4[ ]	

DO NOT WRITE

7. Prior to your attending the cluster meeting, how clear were the purposes of the meeting to you? *(Circle one)*

5	4	3	2	1	20
Very Clear	Quite Clear	Somewhat Clear	Hardly Clear	Not Clear	

8. Was your initial reason for attending the cluster meeting a result of your own desire to attend the meeting, or to satisfy the request of someone else, or both? *(Circle one)*

Your own desire to attend . . . 1[ ]
At other person's request . . . 2[ ]
Both. . . . . 3[ ] 21

9. *(If only at other person's request)* Identify this person by indicating his major role in TTT (e.g., Cluster or Project Director).

_____ ( )22

10. A few clusters have had more than one general meeting. Have you attended an earlier meeting besides the one you attended most recently?

Yes . . . . 1[ ] No . . . . 2[ ] 23

11. *(If yes)* How would you rate this most recent meeting compared to the earlier one?

Substantially better . . . . . 1[ ]
About the same . . . . . 2[ ]
Substantially worse. . . . . 3[ ] 24

12. If another cluster meeting were to be held, would you recommend attendance to others like yourself?

Yes . . . . 1[ ] No . . . . 2[ ] 25

13. *(If no)* Why not?

_____ ( )26
( )27
_____ ( )28

_____

DO NOT WRITE

14. Below are listed the major purposes of clustering. For each purpose, check the category that best indicates the importance you personally place on it.

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	
A. To monitor and give direction to projects .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	29
B. To coordinate projects for their mutual benefit	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	30
C. To disseminate information among program components.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	31
D. To foster and establish a broad base of support for the program	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	32
E. To stimulate exchange and interaction	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	33
F. To provide communication between the project and USOE. . . .	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	34

15. In regard to the above purposes, circle the letters of those three purposes that you feel are considered most important by the USOE.

A B C D E F ( )35 ( )36 ( )37

16. For each of the above purposes, indicate how well you feel they are presently being fulfilled.

	Quite Well	Somewhat	Not Well	
A	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	38
B	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	39
C	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	40
D	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	41
E	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	42
F	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	43

17. In general, do you agree with the purposes of the cluster activity? *(Circle one)*

5	4	3	2	1	
Highly	Quite	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at all	44

DO NOT WRITE

18. Indicate the extent of your familiarity with the activities of your local TTT project and your familiarity with your cluster.

	Highly Familiar	Quite Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Hardly Familiar	Not Familiar	
Project:	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	45
Cluster:	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	46

19. Within your TTT cluster (but outside your project), think of one project activity, if any, that impresses you highly. Briefly describe this activity.

_____ ( )47
_____ ( )48
_____ ( )49

20. Indicate how you initially became familiar with this project activity (e.g., newsletter, visitation, personal contact).

_____ ( )50

21. To what extent have you interacted (verbally or through correspondence) with the personnel of this activity since finding out about it? *(Circle one)*

5	4	3	2	1	
High Interaction	Much	Some	Little	No Interaction	51

22. Have there been any changes in your thinking, do you intend any changes in your project, or have changes been made in your project which could be attributed to this feature with which you have been impressed?

Yes, change in thinking . . . . . 1[ ] 52
Yes, change in thinking and intended change in project . . . . . 2[ ]
Yes, change in thinking and actual change in project . . . . . 3[ ]
No change in thinking, no intended change, and no actual change in project . . . 4[ ]

23. *(If yes)* Specify the change and its substance.

_____ ( )53
_____ ( )54

DO NOT WRITE

24. To the best of your knowledge, indicate the extent to which parity is being achieved in each situation listed below. *(Check one for each situation)*

	For the most part	Somewhat	Little, if any	
Your project planning	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	55
Your project operation	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	56
Cluster meeting planning	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	57
Cluster meeting program	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	58

25. For each of Project planning and Project operation, indicate the extent to which you estimate your project will be <u>able to deliver</u> parity in the next one to two years.

	Project Planning	Project Operation	
Substantially . . .	[ ]	[ ]	59
Moderately.	[ ]	[ ]	60
Somewhat.	[ ]	[ ]	
Little.	[ ]	[ ]	
Not at all.	[ ]	[ ]	

26. To what degree are you satisfied with the present organizational structure of your cluster, which is basically geographic?

5	4	3	2	1	
Highly	Quite	Somewhat	Little	Not at all	61

27. *(If not at least quite satisfied)* Indicate the structural arrangement that you would recommend for reorganizing the present cluster (e.g., topical, size of project, city-rural).

_____ ( )62

_____

_____

28. Are you aware of your project's involvement in the sharing of resources (personnel, materials, ideas) with other projects?

Yes . . . . 1[ ] No . . . . 2[ ] 63

29. *(If yes)* What specific resources have been shared between your project and others?

_____ ( )64

_____

DO NOT WRITE

30. The following items have been prepared so that you can indicate how you <u>feel</u> about important aspects of TTT. In each case, circle the letter which represents <u>your</u> reaction as to whether you Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), are Neutral (N), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD). If you would like to clarify your answer, please do so.

A. Too much emphasis has been placed on parity in TTT. . . . SA A N D SD | 65

B. I would like to meet with people in other projects outside of my cluster. . . . . SA A N D SD | 66

C. Educationists are overly concerned with their professional role in teacher education. . . . . SA A N D SD | 67

D. The project with which I am associated has not fulfilled the hopes I had for it . . . . SA A N D SD | 68

E. I made new contacts useful to me in my role in TTT at the cluster meeting. . . . . SA A N D SD | 69

F. The liberal arts and science people are truly involved in the teacher-education programs . . . . . SA A N D SD | 70

G. My attitude about TTT is one of enthusiasm. . . . . SA A N D SD | 71

		DO NOT WRITE
H. I do not see the value in my attending cluster meetings. .	SA A N D SD	72
I. Too little attention has been given in TTT to the culturally different	SA A N D SD	73
J. In my opinion clustering has greatly increased the communication among TTT projects . .	SA A N D SD	74
K. I would prefer to be in a cluster in which the projects were similar to ours.	SA A N D SD	75
L. The cluster meeting was timely in terms of activities at the TTT project in which I am directly involved	SA A N D SD	76
M. Most demands of the community people are reasonable	SA A N D SD	77
N. The purposes of the cluster meeting were clear to me. . .	SA A N D SD	78
O. The schools are the place for teacher education to happen .	SA A N D SD	79
P. In general, the topics presented and discussed at the cluster meeting were not relevant to me in my position in TTT. . .	SA A N D SD	80

APPENDIX C: Cluster Meeting Registration Form

CLUSTER MEETING REGISTRATION FORM

Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program

1. Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) _____
(last) (first)

2. Address _____
(street) (city) (state) (zip)

3. Telephone _____ Date _____
(area code) (number) (month) (day) (year)

4. How many Cluster Meetings have you attended previously?

None . . . . [ ] One . . . . [ ] Two . . . . [ ] Three or more . . [ ]

5. Identify the TTT Project with which you are connected, if any.

_____

6. With which one of the following parity groups do you *primarily* identify? *(Check one)*

Community . . . . . [ ]
Teacher Education . . . [ ]
Liberal Arts. . . . . [ ]
Participant . . . . . [ ]
School. . . . . [ ]

7. Within this primary parity role, what is your main working role in TTT?

Cluster Director . . . [ ] USOE Staff. . . . . [ ]
Project Director . . . [ ] Student . . . . . [ ]
LTI Member . . . . . [ ] Advisory Member . . . [ ]
Project Staff. . . . . [ ] Consultant. . . . . [ ]
Other _____ . . [ ]
(specify)

8. Approximately what percent of your total working time is spent in your primary role with TTT?

Less than 25% . . . . . [ ] 50% - 74% . . . . . [ ]
25% - 49% . . . . . [ ] 75% or more . . . . . [ ]

9. Approximately how long have you been affiliated with TTT in this capacity?

_____

10. Do you have a work role outside TTT? *(Check one)* Yes . . . [ ] No . . . [ ]

11. *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the firm or organization for whom you are employed. Give job title. Describe the nature and specific duties of your work activity.

Institution or Firm _____

Title _____

Activity and duties _____

_____

12. About what percent of your total working time is spent in this outside role? *(Check one)*

Less than 25% . . . . . [ ] 50% - 74% . . . . . [ ]
25% - 49% . . . . . [ ] 75% or more . . . . . [ ]

APPENDIX D: Site Visitor Briefing Postal Cards

1. In your own words, what are the major purposes of the site-visit. Briefly, please.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How would you personally rank the importance of each of the following groups in your ideal teacher training program? (1 is high, 5 is low)

_____ Community _____ College of Education

_____ Liberal Arts _____ Schools

_____ Student

1. Please describe what was most valuable to you at the Site-Visitor Briefing for preparing you for the site-visit. _____

_____

_____

_____

2. What one thing would have most improved the Site-Visitor Briefing? _____

_____

_____

_____

Given your knowledge of TTT, to what extent do you feel the concept of TTT (parity, relevance, change) is new and different? (Circle one)

5	4	3	2	1
Extremely	Rather	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at all

Are you aware of any teacher training programs (local or national in scope) with similar goals as the TTT Program? If so, describe the most familiar one.

_____

_____

_____

How do you see the concept of TTT influencing American education?

5	4	3	2	1
Highly	Much	Some	Little	None

For each of the five major sessions of the Site-Visitor Briefing, indicate the importance of the session.

Session	Most	Much	Some	Little	No
Evening Group (Parity).....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Morning Orientation (Rivlin and Bigelow)....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Morning Training (Schmieder and Crockett)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Luncheon Meeting (Team).....	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Afternoon Discussion (Rivlin and Subleaders).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

For each item indicate how you feel about certain aspects of the Site-Visitor Briefing. Check whether you agree, disagree, or are undecided.

	Agree	Disagree	Undecided
1. I understand TTT quite well	( )	( )	( )
2. The purposes of the meeting are clear to me.....	( )	( )	( )
3. The material presented was clear to me.....	( )	( )	( )
4. I know what the purposes of the site-visit are.....	( )	( )	( )
5. My role in the site-visit is clear to me.....	( )	( )	( )

1. For the task facing you in the forthcoming site-visit, indicate for each of the following areas how well the Site-Visitor Briefing prepared you.

Area	Good	Fair	Poor
Knowledge about TTT.....	( )	( )	( )
Purposes of site-visit.....	( )	( )	( )
Use of the Report Form.....	( )	( )	( )
Administrative arrangements.....	( )	( )	( )
Techniques for site visiting.....	( )	( )	( )
Knowledge about site projects.....	( )	( )	( )
Sources of information at site.....	( )	( )	( )

2. Have you previously participated in a site-visit for a state, federal, or accrediting agency?

Yes ( ) No ( )

1. Had you heard of the TTT prior to your being contacted to serve as a site-visitor? Yes ( ) No ( )
2. If yes, indicate the primary source and approximate date. _____

_____

3. Did you have adequate information about the Site-Visitor Briefing before it started? Yes ( ) No ( )
4. If no, what would you like to have known?

_____

_____

5. In general, indicate the extent to which the intended objectives of the meeting were achieved.

5	4	3	2	1
Extremely	Rather	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at all

Briefly indicate what you will look for during the site-visit with respect to each of the following:

1. Institutional Commitment _____

_____

_____

_____

2. Educational and Social Relevance _____

_____

_____

_____

For each item indicate how you feel about certain aspects of the Site-Visitor Briefing. In each case, check whether you agree, disagree, or are undecided.

	Agree	Disagree	Undecided
1. I am satisfied with the briefing I had in preparation for the site-visit.....	( )	( )	( )
2. My attitude toward Federally sponsored programs is more favorable than it was.....	( )	( )	( )
3. I can see little advantage of the TTT Program over other teacher training programs.....	( )	( )	( )

Briefly indicate what you will look for during the site-visit with respect to each of the following:

1. Parity _____

_____

_____

_____

2. Change and innovation _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX E: Site Visitor Questionnaire

SITE VISITOR QUESTIONNAIRE
Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation

DO NOT WRITE

This questionnaire is completely confidential. Responses will be treated in summary form and names will not be associated with specific replies. Names are to be provided only to facilitate coordination of returns.

1. Name _____ Date _____
   (last) (first)

2. Had you heard of TTT prior to your being contacted to serve as a site visitor?

   Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 11

   3. *(If yes)* Indicate the primary source.

   _____ ( )12 ( )13

4. In addition to participation as a site visitor, do you have a direct connection with any aspect of the TTT program?

   Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 14

5. Personally, how would you characterize the purpose of the site visit? *(Check no more than two or three)*

   A. To make a *judgment* about whether a project should be refunded . . . . . 1[ ] 15

   B. To *assist* the project staff in viewing their own activities from an outsider's perspective. . . . . 2[ ] 16

   C. To *evaluate* the effectiveness of the TTT National Program . . . . . 3[ ] 17

   D. To *describe* what the project is doing and how it is doing it . . . . . 4[ ] 18

   E. To *learn* more about the TTT National Program. . . . . 5[ ] 19

6. How much impact do you think your visit had on the project you visited? *(Circle the number)*

1	2	3	4	5	20
Great Impact	Much Impact	Some Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	

DO NOT WRITE

7. Indicate <u>one</u> important way your visit affected the project you visited.

_____ ( )21

_____ ( )22

_____

8. To what extent is the project you visited making progress toward the goal of involving <u>community</u> people in the task of training better teachers?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	23

9. . . . toward the goal of involving <u>arts and science</u> people . . . ?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	24

10. . . . toward the goal of involving <u>public school</u> people . . . ?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	25

11. . . . toward the goal of involving TTT <u>participants</u> (students) . . . ?

1	2	3	4	0	
Much Progress	Some Progress	Little Progress	No Progress	No Knowledge	26

12. Relative to other federally supported educational programs, how would you rate the <u>social relevance</u> of the TTT program?

More relevant than any other	1[ ]	27
More relevant than most.	2[ ]	
Of average relevance	3[ ]	
Less relevant than most.	4[ ]	
Least relevant	5[ ]	

DO NOT WRITE

13. The primary focus of the TTT project I visited is on training teachers to better serve our educationally disadvantaged population.

True . . 1[ ] False . . 2[ ] Undecided . . 3[ ] 28

14. Ignoring for a moment the social orientation of the TTT project you visited, how would you rate the overall <u>educational merit</u> of this project?

1	2	3	4	5	29
Very High Merit	High Merit	Average Merit	Low Merit	Very Low Merit	

15. A project might or might not have "educational merit," but would you consider the project you visited to be <u>educationally innovative</u>?

1	2	3	4	5	30
Extremely Innovative	Rather Innovative	Somewhat Innovative	Hardly Innovative	Not at all Innovative	

16. *(If at least somewhat innovative)* Name one major way.

( )31

( )32

17. Do you think TTT projects are doing a good job of creating educational <u>change agents</u>: people who will be able to bring about changes in education in the future?

Yes, very good job	1[ ]	33
Yes, fairly good job	2[ ]	
Average job	3[ ]	
No, fairly poor job	4[ ]	
No, very poor job	5[ ]	

18. Relative to other teacher training programs you know about, how does TTT compare?

It is generally better	1[ ]	34
It is about the same	2[ ]	
It is generally poorer	3[ ]	
No basis for comparing	4[ ]	

19. How do you see the concept of TTT broadly influencing the training of teachers?

DO NOT WRITE

1	2	3	4	5	
Highly	Much	Some	Little	Not at all	35

20. My attitude toward federally supported programs is more favorable than it was before making the site visit.

Agree . . 1[ ] Disagree . . 2[ ] Undecided . . 3[ ] 36

21. Have you made a continuing commitment to an aspect of the TTT program since participating in the site visit?

Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 37

22. *(If yes)* Indicate the nature of the commitment.

_____ ( )38
( )39

_____ ( )40

23. *(If no)* Would you be willing to assist an aspect of the TTT program in a consultative role?

Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] 41

24. If a friend of yours asked you to write a letter in support of the TTT National Program, could you in good conscience be supportive from what you know about the program?

Yes . . . 1[ ] No . . . 2[ ] Undecided . . . 3[ ] 42

25. Name a person with similar work responsibilities as yourself who favorably views the TTT program.

Name _____

Title/Position _____

Address _____

26. Please indicate a primary aspect of the program on which this person bases his favorable attitude.

_____ ( )43
( )44

_____ ( )45